

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-6024

QUENTIN MCLEAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BENJAMIN N.A. KENDRICK, in his individual and official and judiciary capacity as circuit court judge, Arlington County; ABIGAL FELLOWS, in her capacity as complainant who participated in joint activity with the state or its agents of Arlington County; JANELL M. WOLFE, in her individual and official capacity as a public defender with Arlington County; BARBARA WALKER, in her individual and official capacity as Deputy Commonwealth Attorney of Arlington County; JANE MORRIS, in her individual and official capacity as a detective of police department of Arlington County; JOHN DOE, that have not been indicated are unknown to the plaintiff at this time but reserve the right to amend this suit to include those persons unknown at first opportunity; JANE DOE, that have not been indicated are unknown to the plaintiff at this time but reserve the right to amend this suit to include those persons unknown at first opportunity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (CA-98-1302-2)

Submitted: May 25, 1999

Decided: June 1, 1999

Before ERVIN, WILKINS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Quentin McLean, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Quentin McLean appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1998) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See McLean v. Kendrick, No. CA-98-1302-2 (E.D. Va. Nov. 30, 1998).^{*} We deny McLean's motion for appointment of counsel. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on November 25, 1998, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on November 30, 1998. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).